



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,540	08/26/2003	Milind R. Naphade	YOR920030316US1	2284

21254 7590 07/29/2009
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

LIEW, ALEX KOK SOON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/29/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/647,540

Applicant(s)

NAPHADE ET AL.

Examiner

ALEX LIEW

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period **will** apply and **will** expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply **will**, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-13 and 15-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-13 and 15-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. The amendment filed on 5/4/09 is entered and made of record.

2. **Response to applicant's arguments**

I. On pages 13-14, the applicant stated: "Paek, however, does not analyze a plurality of descriptors to determine their corresponding regions on an image and then assign the descriptors to the corresponding regions. Instead, Paek discloses extracting information from an image and using the image to create object hierarchies (Figure 1B) and entity-relation graphs (Figure 1C) ... Paek does not teach or suggest assigning annotations to an image let alone teach or suggest accepting an image having annotations and assigning the annotations to regions on the image."

No where in any of the claims recite "... *analyze* a plurality of descriptors to determine their corresponding regions on an image and ..." However, Paek (WO 00/28467) discloses an image acceptance device that receives an image having a plurality of descriptors and a plurality of image regions (see figure 8, element 206, receives image data containing plurality of image regions, figure 1areceives annotation from 290).

II. On page 14, the applicant stated: "Thus, Paek does not teach or suggest, *"an image acceptance device that receives an image having a plurality of descriptors and a plurality of image regions"*, as recited in exemplary claim 1 and as somewhat similarly recited in exemplary claims 4, 8, 10, 12, 16-18, and 20-23." Paek discloses an image acceptance device that receives an image having a plurality of descriptors and a plurality of image regions (see figure 8, element 295, the image/video database receives plurality of descriptions from 211, 221 ... 281 and image regions from 205).

III. The examiner will maintain the same rejections and will address the different devices disclosed in the claimed invention as requested by the applicant. Paek discloses image acceptance device (see figure 8, 210 receive image content from 205), propagator (see figure 8, the lines are read as medium for propagating information), a descriptor acceptance device (see figure 8, 290 receive descriptions from 211 to 281) and an image processing device (figure 8, 230 is a device which perform image processing, segmentation).

IV. On page 15, the applicant stated: "Furthermore, Hennessey does not teach or suggest recognizing a correspondence between the plurality of descriptors and the plurality of image regions. Indeed, the system of Hennessey does not even receive an image with descriptors, let alone recognize a correspondence between the plurality of descriptors and the plurality of image regions."

The examiner does not agree;

Hennessey discloses at least one first descriptor associated with a first content granularity (figure 20, produces a plurality of descriptors, figure 1, the identification part is read as the descriptor acceptance device, the computer generates the descriptors shown in figure 20); an image processing device that process the image and recognizes a correspondence between said plurality of descriptors and said plurality of image regions (figure 30, an object is taken from an image; a plurality of descriptors is assigned to this single object, descriptors such as size of object, average color, edge

Art Unit: 2624

sharpness, etc, a single object comprises of a plurality image regions, for example the object in figure 9, 52, the wing portion is read as one region and tail region as another image region) and an automatic descriptor assignment system, without having a user operating the system (figure 2, 207 and 208, the attributes of an object is extracted automatically).

Arguments presented by the applicant were not convincing and the examiner will repeat the same prior art rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 7-9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paek (WO 00/28467) in view of Hennessey (US pat no 6,014,461).

With regards to claim 1, Paek discloses an image acceptance device that receives an image having a plurality of descriptors and a plurality of image regions (figure 8, element 206, receives image data containing plurality of image regions, figure 1a, and receives annotation from 290); and a propagation device that propagates the first

descriptor to a second content granularity that is finer than the first content granularity, and wherein the descriptor propagation device propagates the first descriptor without prior data regarding the first descriptor (see figures 1b, 'photo,' which is a descriptor, is the first content granularity and 'person A' and 'person B,' which are also descriptors, are the second content granularities, the arrows pointing from '03' to '01' and '02' are read as propagation, in figures 1a, the descriptor are labeled without using a hierarchy, which reads on 'without prior data', hierarchy is not use until figure 1b). Paek does not disclose a descriptor acceptance device that accepts a first descriptor associated with a first content granularity and an image processing device that process the image and recognizes a correspondence between said *plurality* of descriptors and said plurality of image regions However, an object in an image can be labeled with more than one descriptor. For example, figure 1a of Paek, "Person A" can also be labeled as "Man."

Hennessey discloses a descriptor acceptance device that accepts a first descriptor associated with a first content granularity (figure 20, produces a plurality of descriptors, figure 1, the identification part is read as the descriptor acceptance device, the computer generates the descriptors shown in figure 20); an image processing device that process the image and recognizes a correspondence between said plurality of descriptors and said plurality of image regions (figure 30, an object is taken from an image; a plurality of descriptors is assigned to this single object, descriptors such as size of object, average color, edge sharpness, etc, a single object comprises of a plurality image regions, for example the object in figure 9, 52, the wing portion is read as one region and tail region as another image region) and an automatic descriptor

Art Unit: 2624

assignment system, without having a user operating the system (figure 2, 207 and 208, the attributes of an object is extracted automatically). One skilled in the art would include plurality of descriptors for an object in an image because to provide more accurate description of the image content improving identification of the object(s) in the image.

With regards to claim 3, Hennessey discloses a repository that stores the first descriptor associated with the first content granularity (figure 28, "Store Vector" the vector contains features of an object, figures 26a and 26b, figure 1, 25 is the repository).

With regards to claim 8, see the rationale for claim 1.

With regards to claim 4, see rationale for claim 1. Hennessey discloses mapping/propagation function (see figure 29, the similarity measures between vectors D and K using dot product). One skilled in the art would include a mapping function because to find the pattern in the database best matches the input pattern, which results in accurate matching.

With regards to claims 2, 9, 20 and 23, see the rationale for claim 4.

With regards to claim 7, see the rationale for claim 3.

Art Unit: 2624

With regards to claims 16 and 17, see the rationale for claim 4.

With regards to claim 12 see the rationale for claim 1.

With regards to claim 13 see the rationale for claim 3.

3. Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paek '467 in view of Hennessey '461 and Sakoe (US pat no 4,479,236).

With regards to claims 6 and 15, Paek and Hennessey disclose all the limitations of claim 4, but do not disclose a second mapping function. Sakoe discloses a second mapping function (see figure 5, 18). One skilled in the art would include a second mapping function because to further determine the total difference between two patterns (see abstract of Sakoe).

4. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paek '467 in view of Sakoe '236.

With regards to claims 10 and 11, see the rationale for claims 1, 4 and 6.

5. Claims 18, 19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paek '467 in view of Sakoe '236 as applied 10 further in view of Hennessey '461.

With regards to claim 18, 21 and 22 see the rationale for claims 1, 4 and 6.

With regards to claim 19, see the rationale for claim 3.

Conclusion

This action is made final. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shorten statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire three months from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within two months of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the three-month shorten statutory period, then the shorten statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however will the statutory period for reply expire later than six months from the mailing date of the final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEX LIEW whose telephone number is (571)272-8623 or cell (917)763-1192. The examiner can be reached anytime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on (571) 272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew C Bella/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/Alex Liew/
AU2624
7/27/09